



Archived at the Flinders Academic Commons:
<http://hdl.handle.net/2328/27231>

This is a scan of a document number DUN/Speeches/0487
in the Dunstan Collection, Special Collections, Flinders University Library.
<http://www.flinders.edu.au/library/info/collections/special/dunstan/>

Title:
Release for Flinders University Paper 'Gita'

Please acknowledge the source as:
Dunstan Collection, Flinders University Library.
Identifier: DUN/Speeches/0487

© Copyright Estate Donald Allan Dunstan

The Attorney-General recently told students at Flinders that the reason for the L.C.L. Budget's taxation increases, was the financial situation which occurred in South Australia under the Labor Government. He said the Labor Government charged to the Loan Programme work that had not previously been charged to the Loan Programme, and that this had placed the present Government in difficulties.

The reason for charging extra works to the Loan Programme concerned the expansion in revenue expenditure on education, health, hospitals, law, order and public safety and social welfare.

I challenge the Attorney-General to point out what expenditure in those areas should not have occurred, or, alternatively, what taxes should have been imposed by the Labor Government to raise the necessary revenue for the expansion in expenditure approved of specifically by the present Government in its submissions to the Commonwealth Government at the last Premiers Conference. Since the Attorney-General has not given a satisfactory answer to questions on this matter, these are the facts.

Under the Playford Government, monies were spent from revenue for a number of public works which elsewhere in Australia were always paid for out of loan monies, but this was achieved by underspending on all major Government services - education, health and hospitals, law and order, and relief of the poor. Under the Labor Government, the expenditure on these services was expanded at least to the level of expenditure in the average of the other States. This meant that we no longer had the same amount of money coming in from taxation to devote to capital undertakings or to buildings and that we had to charge to our Loan Account, our capital works or buildings in the same

way as did the other States. Under Labor, education expenditure went to record levels. We increased health and hospitals expenditure 55% per head of the population, taking it from the lowest expenditure per head in Australia to the highest, and we increased public relief payments, and the expenditure on law and order.

The L.C.L. condemned us for spending the loan monies on buildings but opposed any proposals to gain extra revenue to pay for the extra cost of services. The L.C.L. used their majority in the Upper House to prevent us from getting extra succession duties revenue. They reduced the imposition of compulsory stamp duty on receipts and they issued a whole series of statements constantly that State taxation in South Australia under the Labor Government was too high and should not have been increased even to the small amount of increase which took place under the Labor Government - a lower increase than in any Liberal governed State. Although they condemned our change of budgetary pattern in this way, at the same time the present Attorney-General was in Opposition constant in his criticism of the Government for not spending more than it did on services. He said our public relief was too little, that our education expenditure was too little, that we should spend more in assistance to students; indeed hardly a week passed without him suggesting that we ought to be spending more somewhere. The summary of what they said in those days was that we should increase expenditure, we should lower taxation, we should balance the Budget and that we should not charge to the Loan Programme those buildings which were the new class of buildings we had paid for with loan monies. Well, you know, that is a little sum you can't do and come out with an answer which simply adds up. The L.C.L. were saying a whole series of contradictory things.

In his answer to my question on his statement at Flinders, the Attorney-General revealed the blatant dishonesty

of his statements both in Opposition and now. He is just speaking deliberate untruths to the public. He said that while we were in Government, if we believed that revenue expenditures should be expanded to give increased services, we should have been responsible enough to raise the necessary monies, and yet knowing the financial situation when he was in Opposition, he said that even the amount of taxes we had raised was too much. It seems clear that the Attorney-General does not bother about the truth or honesty of what he says in public so long as what he says is in some way critical of the Labor Party, and he uses it to explain away his own actions.
